H5130 – 0001

IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 5130

International Court of Justice

2

H5130 - 0002

H-5130

Translations of SD Affidavits

H5130 - 0003

SD Affidavit No. 12

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany, ...

Affirmation in lieu of oath

by

WILHELM ZIEBS

I, WILHELM ZIEBS, born on 11.4.1910 at Gleiwitz, domiciled in Blaube Wuerttemberg, profession: economic jurist, at present in the Court Gaol, Nuernberg, make the following statement under oath, after being duly sworn:

I was, from January 1940 to May 1943, legal expert III A (Administra of legal matters for the general life of the people) in the SD Head Sector Koenigsberg, which, at the end of 1942, included the Territory of East Pru with a population of 1,8 million. For the Tilsit SD Sector, the SD Head Sector of Koenigsberg was the competent clerical headquarters for the regi central Party and State Offices of the Gau. The SD Head Sector in Koenigs has never issued an order to the SD Sector in Tilsit to liquidate Jews and Communists. Neither was it entitled to do so. If such an order had been issued by the Office III Organization, it would have been absolutely bound to come to the knowledge of the SD Head Sector in Koenigsberg. The outco of the execution of such an order would likewise have been bound to come the knowledge of the SD Head Sector in Koenigsberg.

The purposes, duties and activities of the SD Sector of Tilsit are very precisely known to me, owing to my activity with the SD Head Sector of Koenigsberg. The execution of Jews and Communists was not one of the tas of the SD Sector of Tilsit. I have been informed that on page 63 of the report by Stahlecker-Document L 180 - the following is stated:

"Communists and Jews liquidated by the Stapo and SD Sector of Tilsit on the frontier, 5.502".

To this, I declare the following: In view of my knowledge of the regional authoritative and active department of Task Group A, I consider the above quotation from Document L 180, indicating an alleged participation of the SD Sector of Tilsit in the liquidation of Jews and Communists, as an erroneous description as to facts and place.

SD Affidavit No. 12

(Page 2 of original)

I moreover declare the following:

SD Head Sector of Koenigsberg, no knowledge has ever been received, up to my transfer in May 1943, to the effect that the SD Sector of Tilsit has liquida Jews and Communists.

I first heard of this when I was in the Court Gaol in Nuernberg. I consider it utterly impossible that the other members of the SD Head Sector of Koenigsberg should have acquired knowledge of this auterior to my departu in May 1943, for I would have heard of it myself. I can therefore positivel state the following:

Should members of the SD Sector of Tilsit have been involved in the executio of Jews or Communists, which I personally consider as inadmissible in view of my activity at the SD Head Sector of Koenigsberg, such activity was exter to the duty of the SD Sector of Tilsit and in any case was not completely overt and therefore did not come to the knowledge of the members of the SD insofar as they were not directly involved. In view of my activity with the Head Sector of Koenigsberg, I declare that the members of the SD did not become aware of this activity of the SD Sector of Tilsit at any definite pe

The facts stated above correspond with the truth. This statement has been made by me of my own free will and without any coercion. I have read it th and signed it.

Sworn and subscribed before me this day : 7.6.46.

s/ WILHELM ZIEBS

s/ ROBERT B. STAIRES
Ist Lt.

SD Affidavit No. 19

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany

Affirmation in lieu of oath

by

Helmut FROMM.

I, Helmut FROMM, born on 26 11 1908 in Hanau/Main, residing in Steinheim/Main Karlstr.32, building technician, at present in the Nuernberg Court prison being duly sworn depose and say:

I have belonged to the SD since October 1934, and was working as assistant, later as an expert and consultant on church matters with the following offices: SD-Upper Section Main in Frankfurt/Main, SD-Upper Section Elbe (later centre) in Chemnitz and Leipzig, Main Office for National Security (RSHA) II/113, finally with the commanders of Security Police and the SD, Section III in Warsaw, Krakow, with the BDS for the Government general in Krakow, since September 1944 with the SD Directing Section Danzig, and since 1.4.1945 until the end of the war with the BDS Copenhagen as III B consultant. Last service rank, SS Hauptsturmfuehrer.

From my experience I can state the following:

A/ For the period of my activity as consultant on church matters with the above mentioned SD upper sections and in the RSHA it can be stated as a matter of fundamental principle that:

1) The SD never worked on a preconceived plan to persecute the churches.

2) No order of this kind was ever issued by anybody.

3) The designation of Section II/11, to which the special office for church affairs belonged, with "ideological opponents", from which the activity of a persecution of the churches on the part of the SD has been wrongly deduced by the Prosecution, is wrong, which has been repeatedly pointed out at the proper time. As a significant example of this the following can be stated: Within the framework of the special office for church affairs all groups with a religious ideology were dealt with for informational purposes, also the so-called "German

Christian" and the so-called racial religious communities (HAUER-movement, Nordic Glaubensgemeinschaft etc.) of which some required the acknowledgment of the National Socialist ideology as a condition for membership. For this reason the use of the term "opponent" or even the reproach of persecuting the churches, was and is absurd.

H5130 - 0007

SD-Affidavit No.19

(Page 2 of original)

Page 2 of the affirmation in lieu of oath by
Helmut FROMM, concerning the SD and the church question.

4) At no time did the SD have the authority to initiate executive Police measures.

B. The material which was being dealt with within the framework of the special church section, was in no way suited for a persecution of the churches and was only used for informing the directors of the section's own offices and the Berlin central office. Reports were not furnished to other offices, that is, authorities, or prepared on their order. In detail the following was worked on for informational purposes:

1.) Outline of the organizations of the groups with a religious ideology.

2.) Gradual change to historical scientific research with an inquiry into the aim and purpose of the organization

3.) Present problems, as for example

AA./ Educational questions

BB./ National culture (Volkskultur) and research on national characteristics (Volkstumskunde)

CC./ Social questions.

C. The church department of the SD at no time worked for or on orders from the Gestapo. From the very beginning a very clear and sharp separation existed between them. The SD had its own information apparatus which served its own information purposes exclusively. Likewise, the Gestapo had its own information apparatus for its executive Police tasks. At the end of 1939 the SD main office was dissolved and along with it the church department in the SD main office also. A number of the church department experts were to a small extent taken over as experts by Office IV of the RSHA (Gestapo), whereas it has to be emphasized expressly that, because of their previous activity, they were in no way trained for executive police activities, but brought with them only a general knowledge for their new tasks and first had to work themselves into their new sphere of activity. The decree of separation, which was announced on 12.5.1941, is later than the facts and merely confirms development which had already come to a conclusion.

Page 3 of the Statement in Lieu of Oath
by Helmut FROMM
Concerning the SD and the Church Question.

D./ The work of the church department with the former SD main office was generally confined to outlining the organizations of groups with a religious ideology. This inventory was, as a practical matter, never finished. The problem had already been attacked in parts in an existential way and was being worked out within the framework of Department III of the RSHA under the designation of religious life.

The above-mentioned facts correspond to the truth. This declaration is made by me voluntarily and without any compulsion. I have read it through and signed it.

s/ HELMUT FROMM
(Signature of Affiant)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8 day of July 1946 at Nuernberg, Germany.

s/ PAUL L. BURGER, Capt. 0-451219
(Name, Grade, ASN)

I, M. L. CUHAUS, being thoroughly conversant with both English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this affidavit.

s/ MARIA L. CUHAUS

SD Affidavit No. 21

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany .....

AFFIRMATION IN LIEU OF OATH

OF

OSKAR EISELER.

I, OSKAR EISELER, born on 7 April 1911 at ZUERICH, Switzerland, residing at Schulstrasse 16, in Horb on the Neckar, by profession a bank official, at present at the Court prison Nuernberg, being duly sworn, depose and say:

As personal consultant I was active from 1 September 1939 to 1 September 194 with the inspector of the SIPO and the Southwest Security Service and from 19 April 1944 to 22 April 1945 with the leader of the Baden Elsass Security Service, respectively later the main sector (Leit-Abschnitt) of the Security Service at Baden.

Concerning the voluntary membership in the Security Service I can, on the basis of my activity in the mentioned spheres and for the duration of the stated periods of time, state the following:

With regard to the induction into the Armed Forces and Waffen SS of the main official members of the Security Service, emergency service became necessary at the beginning of the war. The work of stenographers was formerly carried out by male workers - SS men to Master sergeants in the Hitler Youth (Hauptscharfuehrer) - . It was a question here concerning shorthand and typing. Besides this workers for telephone offices and registries were replaced by female workers. With the establishment of Security Service offices in the Sudetengau, Austria, Warthegau and Elsass Lorraine, which functioned analogously to the Security Offices in the Reich, and increased emergency service obligation became necessary. It should be mentioned that 30 - 35 per cent of the entire personnel were called to the Armed Forces and Waffen SS in the sphere of the former southwestern upper main-sector Stuttgart (embracing the gaus Wuerttemberg-Hohenzollern, Baden and Saarpfalz). The placing of female employees in the main offices of the Security service took place mostly in the course of 1939. On the basis of emergency service duty the number of female workers increased in the course of the war.

SD Affidavit No.21

(Page 2 of original)

Page 2 of the affirmation in lieu of oath of Oskar EISELER concerning: voluntary membership in the Security service/RFSS.

The following personnel report of September 1944 gives one a deep insight into the number of emergency service duties with the SD-leader of Baden-Elsass in STRASSBOURG/ Elsass.

First number - total number

Second number - number of emergency duties.

Office	Complete personnel	male	female
SD-leader Baden-ELSASS	42 - 29	26 - 15	16 - 14
Main outside office MANNHEIM	7 - 5	3 - 1	4 - 4
" " " KARLSRUHE	15 - 9	9 - 4	6 - 5
" " " FREIBURG	6 - 3	3 - 1	3 - 2
outside office PFORZHEIM	2 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 1
" " RASTATT	3 - 1	2 - 0	1 - 1
" " OFFENBURG	2 - 2	1 - 1	1 - 1
" " HEIDELBERG	7 - 5	3 - 2	4 - 3
" " LOERRACH	5 - 2	3 - 2	2 - 0
" " WALDSHUT	2 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0
" " DONAUESCHINGEN	2 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0
" " KONSTANZ	5 - 3	3 - 1	2 - 2
" " VILLINGEN	3 - 0	1 - 0	2 - 0
" ") TAUBERBISCHOFSHEIM)	2 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0
Main outside office STRASSBURG	12 - 8	8 - 5	4 - 3
" " " MUELHAUSEN	13 - 7	7 - 3	6 - 4
outside office KOLMAR	4 - 3	2 - 1	2 - 2
outside office HAGENAU	3 - 2	1 - 0	2 - 2
" " ZABERN	3 - 1	2 - 0	1 - 1
	total 138 - 81	78 - 36	60 - 45

divided into -

A/ male personnel	total	78
of it - mostly	42	53.86 percent
emergency obligations	36	46.14 percent
B/ female personnel	total	60
of it - mostly	15	25.00 percent
emergency obligations	45	75.00 percent

(combined)

total personnel		138
therefore - main official personnel	57	41.30 percent
emergency obligated personnel	81	58.70 percent

total 138

SD Affidavit No.21

(Page 3 of original)

Page 3 of the affirmation in lieu of oath of Oskar EISELER

concerns - voluntary membership in the SD/RFSS

-.

This example should give a typical picture. If therefore in an SD-office with a total personnel of 138 employees

58.70 per cent

were obligated to emergency service on the basis of a legal decree, one can hardly say that at the beginning of the war membership in the SD on the whole was voluntary.

The above stated facts correspond to the truth. This declaration has been made by me voluntarily and without compulsion. I have read the same and have signed it.

s/ Oskar EISELER
(signature of affiant)

subscribed and sworn to before me this 22 day of June 1946, at Nuernberg, Germany

s/ Robert B. STEARNS
st.Lt. 0-1284783

(name, grade, ASN)

I, Dr. Paul SCHMIDT, being duly conversant with the German and English languages, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this document.

s/ Dr. Paul SCHMIDT

SD Affidavit No. 39

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany ....

AFFIRMATION IN LIEU OF OATH

BY

ADAM FOERTSCH

I, ADAM FOERTSCH, born 14 May 1904 at Freising/Upper Bavaria, residing at Assenhausen, bookkeeper by occupation last position District Organizational Leader (Gauorganisationsleiter) of Munich-Upper Bavaria, at present in the Court Prison at Nuernberg, being duly sworn depose and say:

I testify on the basis of my activity as District Organizational Leader (Gauorganisationsleiter) of the District of Munich-Upper Bavaria NSDAP (approximately .5 million inhabitants):

The SD of the RFSS did not have any direct and decisive influence in the selection, use, demotion, promotion, punishment, and similar measures of Party leaders (political leaders). The leaders of the Party were appointed by the top officials (Hoheitstraeger) of the Party. The SD RFSS was not consulted in this respect. I know of no order of the Party Chancery which states that the SD-Office III - had to be consulted prior to the appointment or the promotion of Party leaders. I am testifying this for the years 1934-1945.

The above-enumerated facts are in accordance with the truth. I have deposed this declarations out of my own free will, and without having been subjected to any force. I have read and signed the same.

s/ ADAM FOERTSCH

Signature of Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of July, 1946, at Nuernberg, Germany.

s/ PAUL L. BURGER
Capt. O-451219

(Name, Grade, ASN)

I, K. LIKOVSKA, certify that I am thoroughly conversant with the English and German languages, and that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of the above affidavit.

s/ K. L.

SD Affidavit No.43
(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany ....

Affirmation in Lieu of Oath

by

HEINZ WANNINGER.

I, HEINZ WANNINGER, born on 8 May 1913 in MEMMINGEN/ALLGAEU, living in MEMMINGEN, lawyer by profession, at the present time in the Nuernberg court prison being duly sworn, depose and say:

After having passed the great national bar examination in March 1941, I was appointed government assessor for the Reichstatthalter in REICHENBERG (Sudeten-province), while still under the obligations to perform emergency service for the SD-RFSS which I had assumed early in 1943 after having taken part in the Polish campaign. While performing this service in the SD I was active since August 1942 in Department I (Personnel and organization) of the RSHA, where from April 1943 until 1945 the special section (Referat) "General Organizational Matters" and from the beginning of 1944 until April 1945 the special section "General Personnel and Welfare Matters, Personal Data on Special Service Units (Einsatzpersonalien)" were subordinate to me. Since 20 April 1943 I was Regierungsrat and since June 1943 SS-Sturmbannfuehrer, in accordance with the decree for the equalization of service ranks.

On the basis of my service experience in Department I of the RSHA the circumstances of the formation of the special service units (Einsatzgruppen) are known to me, whereby in my opinion my knowledge is valid for the previous years, as the procedure during the beginning, that is, during the formation of the special service units with respect to personnel and organization was always the same. On this point I can depose the following:

The special service units were not groups of volunteers, but their members were detached to these units from the Security Police and the SD by a legal order, that is, they were commanded to do so in the course of duty.

The above-mentioned facts are in accordance with the truth.

SD Affidavit No.43
(Page 1 of original, cont'd)

This statement is made by me voluntarily and without any compulsion. I have read it through and signed it.

s/HEINZ WANNINGER

Signature of Affiant.

H5130 - 0016

SD Affidavit No.43

(Page 2 of original)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12 day of July 1946

at Nuernberg, Germany.

s/ST.BINDER, Capt.Inf. 358 739

Name Grade ASN

I, being thoruughly conservant with both English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this affidavit.

SD Affidavit No. 44

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany..........

Declaration in lieu of oath of

OTTO OHLENDORF.

I, OTTO OHLENDORF, born on 4 February 1907 at Hoheneggelsen/Hannover, residing at this same place, Ministerialdirector by profession, at present in the Nuernberg Court prison, being duly sworn depose and say:

I was employed as chief of the Department SD-Inland, Branch III, Reich Security Office from September 1939 until its dissolution. From the start of the Russian campaign until June 1942 Head Commissioner of the Chief of the Security Police and of the Security Service at the 11 Army in the East. In this capacity I led during this period the Task Group D. (Einsatzgruppe)

Regarding the question of the task groups and task commands in the East I would make the following statement:

Question 1: Did the task groups, assigned in the East to the army groups A, B and C and to the 11 Army, belong to the organization of the SD home services-office III, foreign Intelligence service office VI, or of the SD-office VII of the Reich-Security office?

Answer: No.

Question 2: What was the designation of these task groups and of their subordinate groups?

Answer: Task group A to D, Task Command 1 to 12, special command, for instance 10a, 10b, Part command 10b with place designation.

Question 3: Is it therefore right, if those task groups and task commands in their official relation with military and civil departments are described as individual Groups of the SIPO and of the SD or simply as SD task groups or SD task commands?

Answer: No, they were however registered by the commissioner of the chiefs of the SIPO and the SD with the army groups, or with the 11 Army, but described as task group A to D, or task command 1 to 12.

Question 4: Were any units of the organizations of the SD offices III, VI and VII employed with the task groups?

Answer: No. No units of the organizations of the offices III, VI and VII were employed. Individual members of these commands were merely assigned to the units via the office I Reich Security Office. This assignment is comparable with a military call up.

Question 5: Have the offices III, VI and VII issued any orders in respect to the mass-shootings which were executed by the task groups?

Answer: A. During the period of my personal employment the agencies III, VI and VII, did not issue any similar order.

B. Concerning the entire remaining time previous to the collapse I declare that also during this time no similar orders were issued by agency III. As to agencies VI and VII I have no knowledge concerning that period, but as it is known to me that it was the task of agencies VI and VII of the Reich Security Office to issue such orders, it may be assumed that during this time also no similar orders were issued by agencies VI and VII.

Question 6: Was the activity of the task groups known to all, i.e. did all members of the home SD agency III have knowledge of the entire activity of the task groups?

Answer: No. They had in general no knowledge, because principally on account of the general order of secrecy of the agencies or groups, branches and offices of the agencies, as well as the subordinate offices were only advised insofar as this was necessary for the execution of their own tasks.

Question 7: Were you on account of your volunteering ordered to join the task group?

Answer: No. After twice refusing to do so I was ordered to task group D by reason of an order of HEYDRICH.

Question 8: Was your activity as chief of agency III the reason for you being ordered there?

Answer: No. The reason for this order was merely my personality, as HEYDRICH wished to remove me from Berlin at that time, and expected to be able to put an end to my independence shown towards him

SD Affidavit No. 44

(Page 3 of original)

as the result of my being only honorary chief of agency and supreme chief of the central agency.

Moreover there has been a similar case at the honorary appointment of thé chief of the task group A, STAHLECKER, who at the time of his being ordered to join it, was employed at the Foreign Office and therefore could not be removed from an Office in the Reich Security Office.

The above stated facts are conform to the truth. This statement was made by me voluntarily and not under coercion. I have read and signed it.

s/ OTTO OHLENDORF

(signature of Affiant)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14 day of July 1946 at Nuernberg, Germany

PAUL K. FOSTER Inf.Lt. 0-1335262

(Name, Grade, ASN)

I, (illegible) being thoroughly conversant with both English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this affidant.

signature (illegible).

(SD Affidavit No. 56
(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany

Statement in lieu of dath
by
HELMUT FROMM

I, HELMUT FROMM, born on 26.11.1908 at Hanau/Main, domociled in Steinheim/Main, Karlstrasse 32, profession: building technician, at present in Court prison at Nuernberg, being duly sworn, depose and say:

1. Indicating that the witness possesses the knowledge necessary to answer the following questions:

1. Were you active in the General Government?

Yes.

2. During what period ?

From the beginning of the war to September 1944.

3. What function did you perform there during this period? First, auxiliary in the SD Office III RSHA, that is to say, with the commanders of the SIPO and the SD in Cracow and Warsaw. From March 1941, consultant with the Commander of the SIPO and SD. Section III SD RSHA in Cracow, from July 1943 to September 1944 consultant with the commander of the SIPO and SD for the general Government in Cracow, in Section III SD RSHA. Last service rank SS Hauptsturmfuehrer.

II. Concerning the matter:

A. Subject of Evidence There was no cooperation between the SD and the Gestapo in the General Government.

1. Were the Sections III with the commander-in-chief and commanders of the SIPO and SD in the General Government actually separate from the Sections IV Gestapo and V Kripo ? The Sections III Office III Reich Security Head Office with the Commander in-Chief of the SIPO and SD in Cracow and the commanders of the SIPO and SD in Cracow, Lemberg, Lublin, Radom and Warsaw and the SD foreign offices subordinated to these sections were departmentally essentially and materially separate from the other offices of the SIPO. The Sections III

---

had their own staff for the study of dealing with the affairs and their own administrative managers. The directors of the Section IV (Gestapo) and V (Kripo) could not issue directives and orders to the SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) and vice versa. The SD in the General Government received its directives, and orders from Office III of the Reich Security Head Office.

B. Subject of Evidence: Persons who had nothing to do with the SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) appeared in the General Government ostensibly as officers of the SD.

1. Did the SD Officers in the General Government wear a uniform?

   Yes.

2. What uniform did they wear?

   The SS uniform with the SD insignia on the left forearm.

3. Did other persons not in any way connected with the SD wear this uniform with the SD insignia?

   Yes, namely the officers of Sections I, II, IV and V with the commander - in - chief and the commanders of the Sipo and SD.

4. Did the officers of the Gestapo and of the Kripo in particular wear the uniform of the SD with the SD insignia?

   Yes.

5. Did these persons even wear the uniform when they did not belong to the SS?

   Yes.

6. Even if they did not belong to the Party or to any other organization?

   Yes.

7. Were therefore the officers of the Gestapo and Kripo outwardly undistinguishable from those belonging to the SD?

   The officers of the Gestapo and Kripo could not outwardly be distinguished from those belonging to the SD (Office III Reich Security Head office).

8. Can you make any statements as to whether this difference was known to outsiders?

   As a rule, the difference was not known to outsiders.

SD Affidavit No. 56

(Page 3 of original)

9. Did the fact that the members of the Gestapo and Kripo wore the same uniform as the SD lead to confusion?

Yes, the wearing of the same uniform did consistently lead to confusion. The activity of the Gestapo and the Kripo was referred to as SD activity and vice versa.

10. Was also the Sipo summarily referred to by the German Administration as SD? (Sicherheitsdienst = Security Service).

Yes.

11. Did also unauthorized persons who had no connection whatsoever to the Sipo and to the SD identify themselves as members of the SD?

Yes.

12. Did this often happen?

Yes. In an increasing proportion, criminal elements, for instance, appeared in German uniforms including SD uniforms.

13. Did this lead to measures on the part of the German Administration?

Yes. It was, for instance, forbidden after dark to stop at the summons of people in uniform on country roads.

C. Subject of Evidence: Purposes and tasks of the SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) in the General Government.

1. What were the tasks and activities of the SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) in the General Government?

Investigation of and report on:

AA. The general state of mind and attitude of the population,

BB. The effects of the measures taken by the German authorities in all domains of life,

CC. The attitude of the population thereto.

2. Did they investigate individual cases or were they concerned with the general frame of mind and attitude towards the measures of the German Administration? The purpose was investigation of the general and typical in every domain of life and not of the individual case.

3. When any utterances unfavourable to the German Administration became known, were the persons involved reported to Section IV (Gestapo)?

No.

4. What were the motives that dissuaded report of these persons to the Gestapo?

By disclosing the names of thes confidential agents to the Gestapo, the SD would have alienated its own source of information.

5. Were persons' names mentioned in the reports at all?

No.

6. How was the report worded when an unfavorable utterance was reported?

In handling a determined subject the usual formula was the following: "It is learned on this subject from.....circles that" (The textual reproduction of the utterance then followed.)

D. Subject of Evidence: The SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) has not taken part in a conspiracy in the General Government.

1. Was it known to you and to the other members of the SD assigned to the General Government that HITLER, together with other persons, had formed a secret plan to perpetrate crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity?

No.

2. Did you and the other SD members assigned to the General Government know that by your activity you helped HITLER and the other participants in the plan in its execution?

No.

E. Subject of Evidence: The SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) had no special formations in the General Government for the elimination and execution of racially and politically undesirable persons.

Statement of Evidence by Trial Brief VI B.

1. Were there any prisoner of war camps in the General Government?

Yes.

2. Did the SD have the management, guarding and administration of these prisoner of war camps?

No.

3. Did the SD in these prisoner of war camps have special formations for the elimination and execution of the racially and politicially undesirable

SD Affidavit No. 56

(Page 4 of original, cont'd)

No.

4. I put before you Document PS 1650 - USA 246 - . Was the SIPO or the SD competent for the execution of this decree in the General Government?

SD Affidavit No. 56

(Page 5 of original)

No.

5. Did the execution of this decree belong to the duties and activities of the SD in the General Government?

No.

F. Subject of Evidence: The SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) was not competent in the General Government for the erection and administration of concentration camps and extermination camps for forced labor and mass murder. - Statement of Evidence by Trial Brief VI D- .

1. Did the SD in the Gen.Gov. have the administration and surveillance of concentration camps?

No.

2. If such had been the case, would it of necessity have been known to you?

Yes.

3. Did the SD have authority to intern persons in concentration and other internment camps?

No.

4. Was cooperation in this included in the tasks of the SD ?

No.

5. Did SD have to erect or administer other camps in the Gen.Gov.?

No.

6. Did the SD have establishments of detention in the Gen.Gov.?

No.

G. Subject of Evidence: Refutation of the Prosecution's assertion. Statement of Evidence VI I of the Trial Brief. I submit to you Document L 37 originating from the Commander of the SIPO and SD for the Radom district. Did the SD have anything to do with it.

No.

H. Subject of Evidence: Refutation of the Prosecutions' assertion. Statement of Evidence VI J of the Trial Brief.

1. I submit to you Document L 53, D.I., the letter of the

Commander of the Sipo and SD for the Radom District, dated 21.7.44, containing the instruction that the number of prisoners in the Sipo and SD gaols must be kept as low as possible. Were there SD gaols in the Gen. Govt.?

No.

II. Did this letter come from an SD office?

No. This can be seen by the official stamp: IV 6 B - 4/43 GRS meaning that this letter was written at Section IV (Gestapo).

III. What is to be understood by Sipo and SD gaols?

This applies to establishments of detention in which the political prisoners of Section IV (Gestapo) were interned.

IV. Was this document drafted by the SD?

No.

I. Subject of Evidence: Refutation of the Prosecution's assertion as contained in Statement of evidence VI E of the Trial Brief.

1. Was it among the duties of the SD (Office III Reich Security Head Office) serving in the Gen. Govt. to carry out the deportation of citizens of occupied territories for forced labour?

   No.

2. Will you look at Document L 61, worded to the effect that the Jews to be conveyed out of the Reich territory are to be replaced by Poles from the Gen. Govt. Did these measures belong to the tasks of the SD?

   No.

3. Did the SD cooperate in this in any way?

   No.

The facts exposed above are in accordance with the truth. This statement has been made by me of my own free will

H5130 - 0027

SD Affidavit No. 56

(Page 7 of original)

and without coercion. I have read it through and signed it.

Signed HELMUT FROMM

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 18 day of July 1946, at Nuernberg, Germany.

Signed PAUL S. BURGER Capt 0-451219

(Name Grade, ASN)

I, KVETA LIKOVSKA, being thoroughly conversant with both English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this Affidavit.

Signed KVETA LIKOVSKA

H5130 - 0028

SD Affidavit No.61

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany ....

Affirmation in Lieu of Oath

by

WALTER SCHELLENBERG

I, WALTER SCHELLENBERG, born 16 January 1910 in Saarbruecken, residing in Iburg/Hannover, lawyer by profession, for the time being at the Nuernberg Court Prison, being duly sworn, depose and say:

From July 1941 until the end of the war I was head of Department VI and from July 1944 until the end of the war head of the military department of the Main Office for National Security (Reichssicherheitshauptamt RSHA).

1) Question: Describe briefly the legal relation of the foreign intelligence service (Departments VI and Military of the Main Office for National Security) to the home intelligence service (Department III of the Main Office for National Security) and to Department VII of the Main Office for National Security.

Answer: Historically department VI of the RSHA was developed from former Central Division III of the Security Service Main Office (in its organizational form up to 1939). To this extent Department VI RSHA can, from the historical point of view, be considered a part of the over-all Security Service. (As it was also always considered by outsiders as such a part of the over-all Security Service). Office VI was part of the over-all Security Service especially from the purely organizational point of view, as well as regarding personnel and factual matters.
In the course of the development of the war Office VI became more and more the recognized foreign political intelligence service of the Reich and therefore grew out of the original Security Service structure.
By HITLER's order of 6 February 1944 a centralized German secret information service was created, to which were assigned on the one hand large parts of the Counter Intelligence Department of the Supreme Command of

(Page 1 of original, cont'd)

the Wehrmacht (OKW) and on the other Department VI of the RSHA. Through the developments brought about thereby, and particularly after effecting through my person a merger of the executive personnel in both departments (VI and Military) from July 1944 on, the apparatus comprising Offices VI and military became a new organization sui generis. From that time on at the latest only a part of the new secret service structure can be considered as a part of the Security Service, and at that only in a formal, organizational sense. From this it can also be deduced that a legal relation with the other departments of the Security Service (III and VII) can be spoken of only conditionally and with restrictions as to time.

SD Affidavit No.61

(Page 2 of original)

2) Question: Did the Home Intelligence Service (Department III), the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) and Department VII of the RSHA have different tasks and objectives?

Answer: Yes. Department VII had the task of operating a political intelligence service abroad and was to that extent the foreign intelligence service of the Reich. The Military Department was the military intelligence service of the Reich. On the other hand, Department III of the RSHA was assigned home intelligence work and Department VI tasks of scientific research. The tasks of Departments VI and Military on the one hand, and VII on the other had accordingly, in principle, nothing to do with each other.

3) Question: What were the objectives and tasks of the foreign intelligence service (Departments VI and Military of the RSHA)?

Answer: Departments VI and Military were the central organ of the German political, military, economic and technical secret service abroad. Their task was to obtain real, secret and official information material about all foreign countries, insofar as political material was concerned also to exploit it, so as to provide the proper Reich Department concerned, the High Political Command and the military leaders, regularly and at the proper time, with an objective picture of the over-all foreign political situation and of the forces, centers of gravity and personalities at work there, as well as of the operative and tactical measures, that is, plans, on the enemy's side and his economic technical and human war potential.

4) Question: Did the Home Intelligence Service (Department III), the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) and Department VII of the RSHA have different activities and methods?

Answer: Yes, the tasks and therefore also the methods of carrying them out were entirely different.

5) Question: In what did the activities and methods differ?

Answer: The differences in activities and methods resulted necessarily

(Page 2 of original, cont'd)

from the diversity of the tasks, insofar as the activity of Departments VI and Military covered only foreign countries, the activities of Department II extended to the home country and the occupied territories, while Department VII was merely a scientific research service, without any assignments of an intelligence nature.

SD Affidavit No.61

(Page 3 of original)

6) Question: Was the structure of the Home Intelligence Service (Department III), of the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) and of Department VII different? In what did the differences consist?

Answer: The Foreign Intelligence Service was organized in a strictly centralized way. Its central office, Departments VI and Military, was primarily divided into groups by countries. Its substructure at home and in occupied territories was extremely small. It naturally had its organizational center of gravity in foreign countries. The structure of Departments III and VII was naturally wholly different. The structure of the foreign intelligence service (VI and Military) primarily attempted to follow foreign models. In Departments III and VII this was not the case. The fundamental difference in the structure of the three departments resulted from this, too.

7) Question: What significance did the fact that Departments III, VII, VI and Military of the RSHA were all subordinate to the Chief of the SIPO and the SD have on the objectives, tasks, activities, methods and structure of Departments III, VII, VI and Military?

Answer: None, with the factually unimportant reservation that for certain personal and administrative questions the personnel and the administration offices of the Chief of the SIPO and of the SD (Departments I and II) had to be consulted.

8) Question: Was, therefore, the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) a entirely independent organization with respect to the Home Intelligence Service (Department III) and Department VII?

Answer: Yes.

Subject: With reference to the "conspiracy" count in the indictment according to the trial brief against the GESTAPO and SD, page 17 of the German translation:

9) Question: Was the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military of the RSHA a part of the SS?

SD Affidavit No. 61

(Page 3 of original, cont'd)

Answer: The numerically larger and more important part, namely the Military Department with its substructure was in no respect a part of the SS. The same applies from 1944 on to those groups of Department VI which for the most part came from the former Counter Intelligence Department of the OKW (VI, - WI - T, VI - Z etc.)

SD Affidavit No. 61

(Page 4 of original)

Concerning the other parts of Department VI the question of membership in the SS is to be answered in the affirmative insofar as the RSHA is to be considered in some respects as the main office of the SS and therefore a part of the SS. Otherwise, obviously, the Foreign Intelligence Service was functionally not a task peculiar to the SS. On the contrary, the Foreign Intelligence Service could have fulfilled its special functions better outside of the administrative limits of the SS, and the SS could have carried out its general tasks just as well without any foreign intelligence service.

10) Question: Were all the members of the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) members of the SS?

Answer: No, a considerable part, even in leading positions, were not.

11) Question: Was the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) a part of the party?

Answer: Department VI in its original form was so, insofar as the SS is to be considered as a part of the party and with the reservation as in the answer to question 9. At no time was it a part of the so-called party organization. Department VI in its later form (from 1944 on) and the Military Department can in no respect be considered as part of the party.

12) Question: Did all the members of the Foreign Intelligence Service belong to the NSDAP?

Answer: No. A considerable part of them belonged neither to the party nor to any of the party organizations.

13) Question: Did the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) have the aim and task of assisting people in the execution of a secret plan for the commission of crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity?

Answer: No.

14) Question: Did the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) have to do police spy service for the GESTAPO?

Answer: No.

15) Question: Did the Foreign Intelligence Service (Departments VI and Military) work together with the GESTAPO and if so to what extent?

Answer: No, with the following reservations:

Beginning with the summer of 1944 and insofar as foreign territory was involved, the task of military counter espionage - formerly handled by Amt Abwehr (counter espionage office) of OKW (High Command of the Armed Forces) was assigned to Bureau VI, department VI-Z. This task involved gaining information of enemy secret agents' activities against Germany so that effective counter measures could be initiated in the Reich in opportune time. This necessitated technical cooperation with the competent counter espionage specialists of Gestapo. Furthermore: after foreign mail censorship previously under the supervision of OKW-had been placed under the jurisdiction/of Bureau IV of RSHA (Reich Security Main Office), the bureaux VI and Military continued their cooperation with the above mentioned agencies without change in methods. Bureau IV, like any other governmental department, was required to make important foreign counter-intelligence reports available to Bureaux VI and Military.

16. Question: Did the Foreign Counter-Intelligence Service (Bureaux VI and Militar have any direct or decisive influence in the selection of Nazi leaders?

Answer: No.

17. Question: Did the Foreign Counter-Intelligence Service test the loyalty and reliability of the government officials on the basis of complete subordination to Nazi ideology and HITLER's leadership?

Answer: No: For example, the tasks assigned to Bureaux VI and Military did not require them to have confidents in the Foreign Office.

18. Question: Was/it the task of the Foreign Counter Intelligence Service - Bureaux VI and Military -/to mark ballots secretly to identify persons who voted no or who turned in ballots during the plebiscite which were not valid?

Answer: No;

19. Question: Was service in the Foreign Counter Intelligence voluntary - generall speaking - or did legal provisions regulate this as far as Bureaux VI and Military are concerned?

Answer: A considerable portion of the Foreign Intelligence Service staff did not join voluntarily; their service was based on emergency legislation which meant that in the case of officers, soldiers and civil servants they had to follow official orders of assignment or transfer without consideration of the individual wishes of the person involved.

Because I lack the necessary papers, I am unable to give exact figures. In my estimation the number of persons who became members in the Foreign Intelligence Service not of their own chosing, amounted to 35 percent in round figures until 1943; from 1944 on that number increased to considerably more than 50 percent.

20) Question: Was the work to be done by Group VI-S RSHA generally known, i.e. did every person connected with that service have knowledge of it?

Answer: No. In keeping with the laws governing so-called treason, Group VI-S was under orders of the greatest secrecy, i.e. almost everything was "Confidential Reich Document", or "Confidential Matter of the Command". Most of the work done by Group VI-S was known not even to me, the Chief Bureau VI, because Skorzeny, Group Leader VI-S received personally special missions from highest quarters through other than official channels.

In reference to: Questions having bearing on War Crimes, a count of the Indictment.

21) Question: re: Figure B of the Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 39 of the German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service have specially detailed units in prisoner-of-war camps for the purpose of electing and executing individuals who were undesirable, racially or for political reasons?

Answer: No.

22) Question: Re: Figure C of the Trial Brief against the Gestapo and SD, page 42 of the German translation. In connection with carrying into effect the so-called Bullet Decree, was it a task of the Military Foreign Intelligence Service to confine prisoners-of-war, recaptured during their flight, in concentration camps for execution?

Answer: No.

23) Question: Re Figure D of the Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 43 of the German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service install or divide concentration camps; did it transport on racial and political grounds undesirable persons into concentration camps and extermination camps for compulsory work and mass extermination?

SD Affidavit No. 61

(Page 6 of original, cont'd

Answer: No.

24) Question: Re: Figure E of the Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 46 of the German translation: Did the Military Foreign Counter Intelligence service participate in the deportation of nationals of occupied territories for slave labor, or was it charged with the supervision of slave labor?

Answer: No.

25. Question: Re: Figure F of Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD page 47 of German trabslation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service participate in the execution of captured commandos and of parachutists, or did it protect civilians guilty of having lynched allied fliers?

Answer: No.

26. Question: Re: Figure G of Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 48 of German translation: Was the Military Foreign Intelligence Service instrumental in putting into effect the so-called Nacht und Nebel Decree, in bringing civilians from occupied territories to Germany for the purpose of turning them over to Secret Courts for conviction?

Answer: No.

27. Question:: Re: Figure H of Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 49 of German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service participate in the arrest and conviction of nationals of occupied territories through special summary proceedings ?

Answer: No.

28. Question: Re: Figure I of Erial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 50 of German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service bring persons into concentration camps for execution because of crimes purportedly commited by their relatives (Sippenhaftung) ?

Answer: No.

29. Question: Re: Figure J of Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 50 of German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service receive orders to murder prisoners in Sipo and SD prisons so as to prevent their being released by Allied Troops ?

Reply: No.

30. Question: Re: Figure K of Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 51 of German translation: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service participate in the confiscation and distribution of public and private property?

Answer: No.

Subject: Crimes against Humanity - Count of Indictment.

31. Question: Relative to page 53 of the German translation of the Trial Bri against Gestapo and SD: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service participate in the persecution of Jews, especially in the action called "Eichmann"?

Answer: No.

32. Question: Relative to page 57 of the German translation of the Trial Bri against Gestapo and SD: Did the Military Foreign Intelligence Service take part in the persecution of Churches?

Answer: No.

33. Question: Did Bureau VI issue orders to the special task groups employed in Army Groups on the Eastern Front with regard to mass shooti

Answer: No.

34. Question: Did Bureau VI give orders of any kind to special task groups and special task commandos in connection with mass shootings?

Answer: No.

35. Question: Did members of Bureau VI know of executions through the special task groups on the Eastern Front?

Answer: No.

The above-mentioned facts are the truth; I made this declaration of my own fre will and not under duress of any kind; I have read it and signed it.

s/ WALTER SCHELLENBERG
(Signature of Affiant)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of July 1946, at Nuernberg, Germany.

s/ T.H.BINDER, Capt., Inf.,
0-358239

I, EMMA D. SCHWABENLAND, being thoroughly conversant with both in English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this affidavit.

s/ EMMA D. SCHWABENLAND.

SD Affidavit No. 63

(Page 1 of original)

Nuernberg, Germany

Declaration in lieu of an oath

by

Dr. Paul DITTEL

I, Dr. Paul DITTEL, born on 14 January 1907 at Mittweida in Saxony, residing at Westerfeld near Suederluegum, geographer and historian by profession, last assistant customs official, at present in the court prison at Nuernberg, being duly sworn depose and say:

I was employed from 1935 until its dissolution in the Security Service (SD) of the Reich-leader SS (RFSS) as a scientific research consultant (Referent), librarian as well as keeper of the archieves. From 1939 until 1943 I was charged with the leadership of the Department (Referat) VII C 3 (Archives), and since 1942 in addition to this with the leadership of the Group VII C. In April 1943 I was charged with the administration of Office (Amt) VII of the RSHA. Last rank of service: SS-Obersturmbannfuehrer in the SD.

In virtue of this activity of mine, I testify:

1. Question: Describe briefly the legal relationship of the Office (Amt) VII (World-Philosophical Research) to the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters of the RSHA) and to the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office (Amt) III of the RSHA).

Answer: Office VII (World-Philosophical Research and Evaluation) did not originate from the SD-Main Office, but was established in September 1939 on the occasion of the provisional foundation of the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA) at first under the title of Office II additionally as a scientific research agency concerning ideological and world philosophical opposing groups, as library, archives and press-archives. Approximately in the spring of 1940 it received the title of Office VII (World-Philosophical Research and Evaluation). Office VII in its organization as well as in its tasks and its aims was established independently of the

Intelligence Service in the interior (Office III) and from the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters).

2. Question: Did the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office III),

---

the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters) and Office VII of the RSHA have different aims and duties?

Answer: Yes. Office VII had duties in connection with libraries, archives, press-archives, and research. Office III had interior intelligence, Office VI foreign intelligence, and the Office for Military Matters had military intelligence duties. The Offices III and VI, on the other hand, have in individual cases made use of Office VII, as was also done by other agencies. For the most part Office III has received literary pointers and the generally accessible publications of Office VII. Office VI used the press-archives.

3. Question: What were the aims and duties of Office VII?

Answer: Office VII had the task of establishing and making use of a scientific library, political-historical-cultural-historical archives and Freemason ritual archives as well as press archives on the basis of a press cutting-office. It furthermore had the task of practicying scientific research concerning ideological- world-philosophical groups and general cultural historical problems, as well as to give information and scientific findings on the basis of the book and archive material on hand.

4. Question: Did the Intelligence Service of the Interior (Office III, the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters) and Office VII of the RSHA have different activities and methods?

Answer: Yes. Tasks and methods were completely different.

5. Question: Wherein did these activities and methods differ?

Sheet 3
of the Declaration in Lieu of an Oath
by Dr. Paul DITTEL
concerning Office (Amt) VII of the RSHA

Answer: The activitis and methods differed in this respect, that Office VII engaged in activities concerning libraries, archives and press archives according to the method of scientific libraries and archives, as well as in scientific research after the manner of scientific institutes. The most important results of the work of Office VII were generally published, in which case the competent collaborators of Office VII signed as authors. The activities and methods of the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office III) and of the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters) aimed, however, at the procurement of reports and information, and their use.

6. Question: Did the construction of the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office III), of the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters) and of Office III vary? In what did these differences exist?

Answer: The organization of Office VII varied fundamentally from that of the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office III) and from that of the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters). Office VII only worked in the headquarters, which consisted of a library, archives, a press-archives and a group for scientific research. Office VII did not control any "Unterbau" i.e. no subordinate agencies in the interior or abroad. The Intelligence Service of the interior (Office III), and the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices VI and Military Matters), on the other hand, disposed over subordinate agencies for the execution of their intelligence duties.

7. Question: What importance did the fact, that the Offices III,VII,VI and Military Matters of the RSHA were all subordinated to the Chief of the Security Police and the SD, have on the aims, duties, activities, methods and the organization of Offices III,VII,VI and Military Matters?

Answer: The subordination of the Offices III,VII,VI and Military Matters to the Chief of the SIPO and the SD was not of any importance for the objective limitation of aims, tasks, activities

Sheet 4
of the Declaration in Lieu of an Oath
by Dr. Paul DITTEL
concerning Office VII of the RSHA

---

and methods as well as for the organization of Offices III, VII, VI and Military Matters. Only with regard to questions of personnel and administration did the personnel-office of the RSHA (Office (Amt) I) and the administrative-office of the RSHA (Office (Amt) II) have to be consulted.

8. Question: Was Office VII therefore a completely independent organization with the Intelligence Service of the interior (Office (Amt) III) and the Intelligence Service abroad (Offices (Aemter VI and Military Matters)?

   Answer: Yes.

   Ref: To the count of indictment of conspiracy, in accordance with the trial-brief against the Gestapo and SD, page 17 of the German translation.

9. Question: Were all members of Office VII members of the SS?

   Answer: No. Of the approximately one hundred members of Office VII, about 50 were women. Of the approximately 40-50 men, 6-8 did not belong to any unit of the SS. The remainder were members of the SS-Special-Unit SD.

10. Question: Were all members of Office VII members of the NSDAP?

    Answer: No. The majority of the women and part of the men of Office VII did not belong to the NSDAP.

11. Question: Did the members of Office VII know that a secret plan existed to commit crimes against the peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity?

    Answer: No.

12. Question: Was it the duty of Office VII, to act as spies for the Gestapo?

    Answer: No.

Sheet 5
of the Declaration in Lieu of an Oath
by Dr. Paul LITTEL
concerning Office (Amt) VII RSHA

---

13. Question: Did Office VII collaborate with the Gestapo and if so to what exten

Answer: No, with the reservation, that Office VII just like other agencies of the Party and of the State, also received books and archives which had been confiscated by the Gestapo for research purposes. Furthermore, the Gestapo, like also other agencies of Party and State, has by request received information on the basis of library and archive-material on hand.

14. Question: Was this information intended in any way and given by Office VII for the purpose, to initiate Gestapo measures for the support of a conspiracy to commit crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity?

Answer: No, since such a conspiracy was neither suspected nor recognized, nor could it be recognized from the circumstances.

15. Question: Did Office VII have direct and decisive influence on the selection of Nazi-leaders?

Answer: No.

16. Question: Did Office VII check the loyalty and dependability of state officials for the purpose of giving influential positions to persons who were prepared to support conspirators, or who had composed a plan to commit crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity?

Answer: No.

of the declaration in lieu of oath

of Dr. PAUL DITTEL

concerning office VII Reich Security Main Office (RSHA)

---

17. Question: Did office VII have the task of marking ballot papers secretly so as to establish the identity of persons who voted no or who handed invalid ballot papers at the plebiscite?

Answer: No.

Concerns: Questions to count of indictment war crimes. To paragraph VI of the trial-brief against Gestapo and SD, page 21 of the German translation.

18. Question: Did the task forces (Einsatzgruppen) who were appointed to the army groups A, B, C, D in the East belong administratively to office VII?

Answer: No.

19. Question: Did any kind of relationship exist between the aims and activities of office VII and the task forces appointed to the East?

Answer: No.

20. Question: Did office VII give any orders to the task forces and task commandos concerning the mass shooting?

Answer: No.

21. Question: Re paragraph VIB of the trial-brief against Gestapo and SD, page 39 of the German translation.

Did office VI have special formations in prisoner of war camps in order to select racial and political undesirables and to execute them?

Answer: No.

22. Question: Re paragraph VI C of the trial-brief against Gestapo and SD, page 42 ofthe German translation. Did office VII have the mission in execution of the

---

shooting decree (Kugelerlass) to transfer to concentration camps re captured prisoners of war for execution?

Answer: No.

23. Question: re paragraph VI D of the trial-brief against Gestapo and SD, page 43 of the German translation.
Did office VII create or classify concentration camps, did it transfer racial and political undesirable persons to concentration camps or extermination camps for compulsory labor and mass murder?

Answer: No.

24. Question: re paragraph VI E of the trial brief against Gestapo and SD, page 46 of the German translation.
Did office VII participate in the deportation of citizens of the occupied countries for compulsory labor, or did it supervise this compulsory labor?

Answer: No.

25. Question: re paragraph VI F of the trial brief against Gestapo and SD, page 47 of the German translation.
Did office VII take part in the execution of captured commandos and paratroopers or did it protect civilians who had lynched allied airmen?

Answer: No.

26. Question: re paragraph VIG of the trial brief against Gestapo and SD, page 48 of the German translation.
Did office VII in execution of the so called Nacht und Nebel decree take civilian persons from occupied countries to Germany, so as to arraign them before secret tribunals and condemn them?

Answer: No.

Affidavit of Dr. PAUL DITTEL
concerning Reich Security Main Office VII (RSHA)

---

27. Question: To number VI H of the Trial Brief against the Gestapo and the S page 49 of the German translation.

Has Office VII taken part in the arrest and condemnation of people of occupied countries in summary special proceedings?

Answer: No.

28. Question: To number VI I of the Trial Brief against the Gestapo and the SD, page 50 of the German translation.

Has Office VII transferred and executed persons in the concentra camps for crimes which were presumably committed by their rela (responsibility of relatives (Sippen-Haftung)) ?

Answer: No.

29. Question: To number VI J of the Trial-Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 50 of the German translation.

Had Office VII the assignment to murder prisoners in Sipo- and SD prisons in order to prevent them from being released by allied troops?

Answer: No.

30. Question: To number VI K of the Trial-Brief against the Gestapo and SD, page 51 of the German translation.

Had Office VII the task of carrying out the confiscation of publ and private property in the occupied territories by force?

Answer: No.

31. Question: To number VII of the Trial-Brief against Gestapo and SD, page 53 of the German translation..

Had Office VI the aim and task of persecuting Jews, and espec of taking part in the action Eichmann?

Answer: No.

SD Affidavit No. 63

(Page 9 of original)

Affidavit of Dr. Paul DITTEL

concerning Reich Security Main Office (RSHA).

32. Question: To number VII B of the Trial Brief against Gestapo and SD, Page 57 of the German translation.

Had office VII the aim and the task of persecuting the Churches?

Reply. The answer is in the negative for the period 1943-1945. Nothing is known to me for the period 1939-1942. I am , however, of the opinion that the answer is in the negative for this period also.

The facts mentioned above are true. This statement is made by me voluntarily and without coercion. I have read and signed same.

s/ Dr. Paul DITTEL

(Signature of Affiant)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13 day of July 1946 at Nuernberg, Germany

s/ Paul S. BURGER, Capt. 0-451219

(Name, Grade, ASN)

I, Kveta Likovska, being thoroughly conversant with both English and German, certify that I have acted as interpreter for the swearing of this affidavit.

s/ Kveta LIKOVSKA

SD Affidavit No. 65

(Page 1 of original)

DEPOSITION IN LIEU OF OATH.

I, Prof. Dr. GERHARD RITTER born on 6 April 1888 at Bad Sooden, full professor of modern history at Freiburg in Breisgau, Mozartstrasse 48, bei duly sworn, depose and say:

1. Question: Will you give further details about your professional positi

Answer: Since 1925 I was full professor of modern history at the University of Freiburg in Breisgau. My special branch is ge modern history.

2. Question: Were you a member of the NSDAP or of one of its organization

Answer: No.

3. Question: Were you a member of a resistance group against the Hitlerit regime and were you persecuted by it?

Answer: Yes, I belonged to Dr. Goerdeler's group of friends and had been proposed by him as Minister of Public Worship and Educati in his new Cabinet. I was, therefore, arrested in November 194 in connection with the events of 20 July, brought before the People's Tribunal in Berlin and there set free from the pris in Lertherstrasse by the Russian army on 25 April 1945.

4. Question: Do you know the activity of the Security Service Workers Association and where does your information come from?

Answer: Yes; my information comes from my activity as chairman of t Purge Commission of the University of Freiburg.

5. Question: What was the duty of the Security Service Working Associatic

Answer:

1.) Informing the Supreme Security Service Leadership (I do not know the exact designation) of the popular mood and criticism of Party measures circulating among the peopl

2.) Setting up of a liaison between the Security Service Leaders and recognized scholars for purposes which are not quite clear to me. It probably concerned the crea of a possibility to exert an independent influence on cultural politics.

(Page 1 of original, cont'd)

3.) Controlling of individual personalities partly with regard to their scientific attitude.

Whether and to what extent political attitude was the subject of discussions, I cannot say with certainty.

SD Affidavit No. 65

(Page 2 of original)

6. Question: What was the aim and the task of the activity of the confidants?

Answer: Aims and tasks in reality were the same as those of the Working Associations, to which the confidants belonged. Whereas, the other members of the Working Associations were only occasionally asked for information and conferences for the Security Service, the confidants were in permanent touch with them.

7. Question: Were there also opponents of the National Socialist State among the confidants and collaborators of the Security Service Working Associations?

Answer: It is beyond doubt that opponents of the system did not belong to the confidants. On the other hand, occasional information was obtained from opponents of the Regime. Once they also asked me for a practical information concerning school questions, although I was certainly known as an anti-Nazi.

8. Question: Was it the confidants' duty to collect and pass on statement hostile to the State and to check persons known as enemies of the State?

Answer: I am not aware of anything definite in this connection. My personal inquiries along this line remained unsuccessful, although I continued to have suspicions. I know that the French authorities also attempted to establish charges within the circle of my suspected colleague and arrested them by virtue of this. I do not know anything definite about the result; I know that a few of the arrested men have been released with the assurance that nothing had been established.

9. Question: Which purpose and which aim did the Home Security Service pursue in its reporting?

Answer: Contrary to the official party information which was frequently glossed over, the Security Service reports were to give a picture corresponding to the actual attitude and conditions. Within the sphere of cultural politics deficiencies and abuses should moreover be pointed out.

SD-Affidavit No. 65

(Page 3 of original)

How far political controlling of the universities was intended, is not clearly recognizable.

10. Question: Did the Home Security Service report on your lectures and speeches and check them?

Answer: Yes. I know that a number of reports and stenographical notes on my lectures and speeches have been found at the Security Service Branch Office at Karlsruhe or at Strassbourg. In addition I can state in this connection that a written exchange of thoughts on the activity of the Security Service took place between me and a number of scholars and high officials, in which it was confirmed to me that my statement agreed in all points with the experiences of these men.

11. Question: Did the Security Service, by virtue of controlling your lectures and speeches, cause the Gestapo to take measures against you ?

Answer: I do not know anything about it.

12. Question: Would the Gestapo have had cause for state police measures if opinions expressed in your lectures and speeches had leaked through to the Gestapo ?

Answer: It is quite natural that I endeavored to be prudent; on the other hand I frequently made statements which the Gestapo doubtlessly could have used for state police measures.

13. Question: Have you been arrested or warned because of your lectures and speeches?

Answer: No. Once, indeed, I was warned by the Gestapo, but due to a denunciation known to me and which did not come from the Security Service.

14. Question: What was the reason for your being arrested?

Answer: Because of my relations with some leading men of 20 July.

SD Affidavit No. 65

(Page 4 of original)

15. Question: Did the questioning officials know about the contents of your lectures and speeches?

Answer: No, apparently not; for they took it as a matter of course, that I referred in my defense documents to the blameless patriotic attitude of my lectures and speeches. I consider out of the question that my lectures and speeches and the Security Service reports based upon them should have been kn to the Gestapo officials.

16. Question: What was the attitude of the faculty of political science at Freiburg towards the Hitlerite Reich?

Answer: Not only the faculty of political science of the University, but at least the greater part of the professors of the human were opponents of National Socialism. At any rate, this was very well known to Dr. SCHEEL, Leader of the Reich universit professors. He announced the dissolution of the whole university until the end of the war.

17. Question: Was this attitude known to the Security Service?

Answer: There can hardly be any doubt about it.

18. Question: Did the Security Service cause the Gestapo to take any measures whatever against the faculty of political science o the other group of professors?

Answer: I know nothing about this.

Freiburg in Breisgau, 26 July 1946

s/ Dr. GERHARD RITTER.

SD Affidavit No.70

(Page 1 of original)

List of collective affidavits.

The following is a list of affidavits which arrived at the Defence Counsel arranged according to points.

Point 1: Aims, tasks, activity and organisation of the SD (Office III RSHA) Statement of Evidence IIIB, English Trial Brief Page 17, Book Dr.BEST 1852 B - PS and the "Archiv" 1956 - PS.

In 640 declarations in lieu of oath of former main officials and honorary members (confidants) of the RSHA - Office III and also in individual statements contained therein the following is asserted for almost all SD sections in the entire German Reich territory for the years 1934 - 1945:

"Aims, tasks and activities of the SD (Office III RSHA) were not the committing of crimes in the sense of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal but independant, objective, German home news service as critical mouth piece of the people for all walks of life."

Point 2: Aims, tasks, activity and organisation of the SD (Office VI RSHA) (St. O.E. III B.English Trial Brief Page 17, Book Dr.BEST 1852 B - PS and "Das Archiv" 1956 - PS.

In 18 declarations in lieu of oath of former members of the RSHA - Office IV it is stated for the entire sphere of the office VI and also in individual statements for different sections and leading section spheres for the year 1939 to 1945:

"Aims, tasks and activity of the SD (Office VI RSHA) were not the committing of crimes in the sense of the Charter of the I.M.T. The office VI was central organisation of the German political, economic, military and technical Secret Service abroad. Its task was to get information concerning all foreign countries. The activity of VI S was not known."

H5130 - 0057

3. Point: Aims, tasks, Activity and Organization of the SD (office VII RSHA)

(St.o.E. III B Engl. trial -brief page 17, book Dr. Best 1852 B-PS and " Das Archiv" 1956-PS)

In two declarations in lieu of oath of a former member of the RSHA - office VII - and of a university professor it is certified:

"The tasks of Office VII of the RSHA was exclusively scientific research as well as the preservation and untilization of records.

4. Point: Voluntary Membership and Activity in the SD in virtue of a legal decree.

(See evidence (Beweisbeschluss) of 13.3.46. paragraph 6 A 2.)

In six declarations in lieu of oath for the sphere of inspectors of the security police and of the SD or SD (leading) division sphere Alsace, Neu-Stettin, Karlsruhe, Klagenfurt, Breslau, Braunschweig, Hamburg, Stuttgart, Dresden, Nuernberg, Pfalz (together a territory of approximately by 30 million inhabitants) it is certified:

"It was impossible for members of the SD (office III RSHA) to resign especially in the period of the main development and activity of the SD from 1939 on"

In 105 declarations in lieu of oath from nearly all services of the occupied territories included in the SD it is certified: "These services of the SD engaged those drafted for emergency duty, draftees, as well as students doing war-time duty (all occupied in virtue of legal decrees.)"

5. Point: Relation and position of the SD to the party

St. o.E. I B engl. Trial brief page 4 1680-PS and III B Page 17 (1956-PS, 1852B - PS)

In 57 declarations in lieu of oath for the whole sphere of the RSHA - office III - and the chancery of the party (the whole territory of the Reich), further in individual declarations for the spheres Wuerttemberg, Braunschweig, Munich-Upper-Bavaria, Berlin-Brandenburg, Niederdonau, Baden, Alsace, Luxemburg, Cologne - Aachen, East-Prussia, Tirol, Frankfurt/Main, Hesse, Sudete territory as well as in further collective declarations and for the time from 1934 to 1935 it is certified:

"The SD did not receive any orders or directives from any officials of authority and political leaders of the NSDAP. Their report was not made for the interests of the party and their leaders. It was not a secret police organ of the party".

6. Point: The relation and position of the SD towards Gestapo.

(ST.o.E. II B and III B. English Trial Brief pages 9 and 17)

In the III Affidavits from the RSHA Office III Berlin, all large German towns, occupied territories in Elsass, Luxemburg, Eupen-Malmedy, Suedeten territory, Italy as well as all SD (Leit) section territories it is assured for the period 1935-45:

"aims, tasks and activity of SD were not directed to support or serve as an auxiliaryfor the Gestapo. The SD together with the Gestapo did not constitute an united police system."

7. Point: Deceitful use of the designation "SD" (linguistic error)

(St.o.E.VI English trial brief, page 25 and following)

In 32 affidavits it is assured for the Reich territory (depositions for a territory with over 37 millions inhabitants) as well as for service sphere of the High Command of the German Armed Forces and further for the occupied territories of Elsass, Eupen-Malmedy, France, Poland, Italy, Lotasingia, Latvia for the years 1935-1945:

"The SD and Security Police were "mistaken" because of the common uniform and the sleeve insignia "SD". The so-called SD uniform with the SD badge on the sleeve was not the uniform of the SD - Department III RSHA - and their news organization, but the uniform of the SS-Special formation "SD" in the RSHA". In it were included all SS-members of the SD, of the Security Police and their related organizations. This uniform was worn also by non-members of the SS who became active in the service of the named offices in uniform or for auxiliary employment".

8.Point: The members of the SD did not participate in a conspiracy.

(St.o.E. III English Trial Brief Page 13)

The following is asserted in 174 statements in lieu of oath for the Reich Security Head Office III, for nearly all German provinces, SD (head) sections and branch offices, cities, towns, provicial districts, for the period 1934 - 1945:

> "It was not the purpose of the members of the SD to help any person in the execution of a secret plan for the perpetration of crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Moreover, they possessed no knowledge of such a plan".

9.Point: Secret Organization of Agents, informants and police spies.

(St.o.E. III B English Trial Brief Page 17)

The following is asserted in 411 affirmations in lieu of oath by leading and honorary officials of the SD and by reliable persons from every professional class, every service department of the SD including the RSHA Office III for the years 1934 - 1945:

> "The SD (office III RSHA) was not a Secret organization of Agents, informants and police spies".

10.Point: Influence on the choice of Nazi leaders.

(St.o.E. III B English Trial Brief Page 18 (Affidavit Dr. HOETTL 2614-PS)

The following is asserted in 151 affirmationsin lieu of oath for the department of RSHA Office III supplemented in detail as regards the Gau leadership or the areas of the SD (head) sections of Baden, Alsace, Hesse, Upper Bavaria, East Prussia, Palatinate, Saar Territory, Brunswick, Wuerttemberg, Berlin, Sudetengau, Saxony, Hanover, Tyrol, Vienna (an area totalling over 30 million inhabitants); and for other medium and lesser service areas of the SD, for the years 1935 - 1945:

> "The SD Office III RSHA and its subordinate offices did not participate in any way in the assignment or promotion of political leaders, high authorities and section leaders of the NSDAP, even by the procurement of information".

Point 11: Examination as to the reliability of officials.

(St.o.E. III B English Trial Brief, Page 18)(Affidavit Dr. HOETTL 2614-PS).

In 132 declarations in lieu of oath for the Reich Security Main Office - Office III and the Party Chancery (competent for the whole of the German Reich territory) as well as individually for the greater part of all former SD (Main) Sector areas and areas of the Gau Leaderships of the NSDAP, it is asserted for the period from 1934 to 1945:

> "The SD passed no judgement on officials. It only gave information mainly as far as character and profession was concerned. The SD had no influence on the policy of the personnel in state and municipal administrations. When the war broke out, there was a radical restriction of this information".

Point 12: Marking of voting-papers.

(St.o.E. III B English Trial Brief, Page 18, 2614-PS and R-142 and D 897)

In 196 declarations in lieu of oath for the former SD Main Office (afterwards Reich Security Main Office), for the territories or the areas of the Main Sectors and Sectors of the SD of Pomerania, Breslau, Silesia, Duesseldorf - Rhine Province, Stuttgart - Wuerttemberg, Dresden-Saxony, Munich - Upper Bavaria, Saarbruecken - Saar District, Nuernberg - Central Franconia, Vienna, Linz - Upper Danube, the Palatinate, Lower Bavaria - the Upper Palatinate, the inspectorate Munich- the whole of Bavaria, Hamburg, Dessau, as well as a great number for towns (totalling with few exceptions the German Reich territory), it is asserted for the years 1935 - 1939:

> "The SD has at no time marked voting - papers or taken similar steps in order to establish who were non-voters. There were also no directives nor orders dealing with this".

Point 13: Participation in border-incidents.

(St.o.E. V English Trial Brief, Page 23)

In 215 declarations in lieu of oath for the Reich Security Main Office, Office III, as well as for nearly all the areas of the SD (Main) Sectors, in particular also for the Eastern areas Kattowitz, Dantzig, Saxony, it is asserted for the years 1939 - 1945:

"The members of the SD had at no given time knowledge of faked border-line cases or participation of the SD in boder-line cases."

14th Point: Activity of the SD in the Occupied Territories.

(St.o.E. VI Engl. Trial Brief, Page 25)

In 35 affirmations in lieu of oath concerning the occupied territories in Belgium, Holland, France, Poland, Italy, Russia, Lorraine, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Croatia, Hungary during the years 1939-1945, it is affirmed:

> "The SD, Office III, RSHA did not take part in war crimes in the occupied territories. It had no executive authority and was only active in intelligence."

15th Point: Participation of the SD in the Special Purpose Units.

(St.o.E. VI A Engl. Trial Brief, Page 25)

In 127 affirmations in lieu of oath by members of the RSHA-Office III for the entire area and some for the territories of Danzig, West Prussia, Lower Franconia, Baden, Styria, Wuerttemberg, Aix-la-Chapelle, Hamburg, Middle Franconia, Dresden-Saxony, Rhine Pfalz, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Middle Germany, Kiel, Pomerania, Cassel-Hesse, Berlin-Brandenburg, Westphalia, Schwerin, Duesseldorf-Rhine Province, (affirmations below for the whole German territory), as well as by the former members of the Special Purpose Units in the East, for the years 1941-1945, it is affirmed:

> " Participation by members of the SD in the tasks of the Special Purpose Units was not known."
>
> For further affirmations of this, see Point 18.
>
> "The Special Purpose Groups and Special Purpose Units formed no part of the organization of the SD-Offices III, VI, and VII. The assignments to the Special Purpose Units were effected through legal orders. The task forces and task units were not a union of volunteers. Only about 3-4% of the SD members were subordinated to the task units, which were only used in intelligence and did not take part in the task itself."

Point 15b. Activity of Taskgroup A (STAHLECKER Report)

(St.o.E. VI A English trial letter page 30)

In 1 Declaration in lieu of oath for the period of 1941 till 1943 it is assured:

"The activity of the SD members in Task-Group A was only in connection with intelligence service as an example of the percentile participation in Task-Group A: Out of 150 members of the Staff only 2 were members of the SD-members in Office III RSHA. As result of wearing uniforms similar to the Stapo and Kripo there was frequent misunderstanding in the description "SD".

Point 15c. Sturmbannfuehrer PUETZ

(St.o.E. VI A English Trial letter page 26)

In one (1) declaration in lieu of oath for the period 1938-1945 it is asserted:

"The Major (SS-Sturmbannfuehrer) PUETZ was since 1938 member of the Gestapo and not active in the SD."

Point 16. Utilization of gas waggons.

(St.o.E. VI A English Trial letter pages 34 and 35 (2348-PS, 2620-PS, 501-PS)

In 60 declarations in lieu of oath by the chief of the clerical department of office III RSHA for the entire area of the department, as well as in individual declarations for the territories of Baden, Carinthia, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Wuerttemberg, Vienna, Upper-Danube, Palatinate, Rhine-Province, East Prussia, Lower Bavaria, Upper-Palatinate, Berlin-Brandenburg, Hesse-Nassau, Wiesbaden, Leipzig, Saxony, Thuringia, Westphalia, Magdeburg-Anhalt, Swabia, further declarations for towns and administrative spheres of the SD, further for the occupied territiry (nearly 2/3 of the entire territory of Germany) are assured for the years 1939-1945:

"The SD (RSHA - office III) had nothing to do with the development and the employment of the so called gas waggons to the members of the SD the existence of such waggons was unknown."

17th Point: Selection and Execution of Prisoners of War - undesirable for racial or political reasons - in Prisoner of War Camps. (St.o.E. VIB English Trial Brief, page 42).

In 266 declarations in lieu of oath for the area of RSHA (Reich Security Central Office), Bureau III, and individually for the regions of South Hannover, Brunswick, Saar Territory, the Palatinate, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Cologne, Wurttemberg, East Prussia, Upper Danube, Vienna, Military Administrative District VII in its entirety, Bavaria, West Prussia, Styria, Sudeten country, Hamburg, Upper Silesia, Tyrol, Central Germany, Westphalia, Magdeburg-Anhalt, Berlin-Brandenburg, Swabia, Silesia, Central Franconia, Warthe region, Thuringia, Bremen, Holstein, Hessen, Saxony and in a considerable number of declarations obtained for individual cities, and also in a collective declaration (covering, with few exceptions the entire German Territory), and in declarations coming from occupied territories of Alsace, Italy, Jugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia, Russia, Poland assurances are offered for the years 1939 to 1945 to the effect that:

> "There existed no SD commandos in prisoner-of-war camps for the selection and execution of prisoners-of-war who were racially or politically undesirable. Nothing was known of a participation by SD in such commandos."

18th Point: Participation of SD members in Executions handled by Special Purpose Commandos (St.o.E. English Trial Brief page 25)

In 140 declarations in lieu of oath coming from all parts of Germany, the assurances are offered for the years 1939 to 1945 that;

> "The official agencies and members of SD (Bureau II - RSHA) had no knowledge of the participation- by SD members - in executions throug the Special Purpose Commandos in the East."

> In this connection I refer to the declarations in lieu of oath offered on point 15a.

19th Point: Putting into Effect the Bullet Decree (Kugelerlass) (St.o.E.VI C, English Trial Brief page 45)

In 288 declarations in lieu of oath covering the entire Reich territory, the occupied territories in Russia, France, Lorraine, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, Poland, the assurance is given for the years 1939 to 1945 that:

"The SD - Bureau III RSHA - had nothing to do with putting into effect of the so-called Bullet Decree".

20th Point: Concentration Camps,

(St.o.E. VI D of English Trial Brief, page 47)

In 289 declarations in lieu of oath for the area of the SD Central Office (later on RSHA Bureau III), as well as for the regions of Brunswick, Aachen, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Saar territory, Palatinate, Wuerttemberg, East Prussia, Upper Danube, Berlin, Vienna, Central Franconia, Styria, Thuringia, Sudeten territory, Hamburg, Upper Silesia, Tyrol, Baden, Leipzig, Central Germany, Westphalia, Rhine Province, Bremen, Hessen, Frankfort on Main, Lower Silesia, Swabia, Bavaria all of East Bavarian Region, Magdeburg, Kiel, Danzig-West Prussia, Pomerania, Kassel-Hessen (all of German Reich territory,) in additional collective declarations for a greater number of cities and service areas of SD, as well as for occupied territory the assurance is offered - for the years 1934 to 1945 :

"That the SD had nothing to do with the establishment and supervision of concentration camps."

1st Point: Deportation and Supervision of Slave Workers.

(St.o.E. English Trial Brief page 51)

In 276 declarations in lieu lieu of oath for the occupied territories in Russia, Poland, Alsace, France, Belgium, Italy, Czecho Slavakia, Jugoslavia, the service area of RSHA Bureau III, as well as individually the territories of Baden, Carinthia, Brunswick, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Saar territory, Palatinate, Rhine Province, Central Germany, Wuerttemberg, Upper Danube Silesia, Berlin-Brandenburg, Styria, Thuringia, Sudeten Territory, Hamburg, Tyrol, Saxony, Lower Franconia, Frankfort-on-Main, Lower Bavaria, Upper Palatinate, Westphalia, Bremen, Schwerin, Swabia, West Prussia, Pomerania, altogether the entire German Reich territory, the assurance is offered for the years 1939 to 1945 that:

The SD had nothing to do with deportations for slave labor or with the supervision of slave workers and slave labor work."

22. Subject: Execution or Maltreatment of Parachutists.

(St.o.E. VI F English Trial-Brief, Page 54)

In 294 declarations in lieu of an oath for the whole field of competence of the RSHA-Office III, as well as individually for the areas of South-Hannover-Brunswick, Upper Silesia, Westphalia, Baden, Munich-Upper-Bavaria, the Saar-territory the Sudeten-territory, Hamburg, Saxony, Central Germany, East Prussia, Lower Bavaria Oberpfalz, Berlin, Hessen, Moselland, Vienna, Upper Danube, Magdeburg, Swabia, Silesia, Schwerin, West-Prussia, Pomerania, Westphalia, as well as a large collective declaration (totalling the German territory) and furthermore for the occupied territories of Alsace, Czechoslovakia, Italy, France, Lorraine, it has been testified for the years 1939-1945:

"The SD did not in any way participate in the execution or maltreatment of Allied parachutists".

23. Subject: Execution of the Night and Fog Decree (Nacht und Nebel-Erlass).

(St.o.E. VI G English Trialbrief Page 54)

In 270 declarations in lieu of an oath for the RSHA-Office III, as well as in individually for the territories of Munich-Upper Bavaria, the Rhine-Province, Wuerttemberg, Hamburg, Hamburg, the Saar-Pfalz, Silesia, Berlin, Styria, Thuringia, the Sudeten territory, Tyrol, Saxony, Baden, Leipzig-Central Germany, Westphalia, East Prussia, Hessen, Moselland, Bavarian Ostmark, Magdeburg, Holstein, Swabia, West-Prussia, as well as a large collective declaration including the German Reich territory) and furthermore for the occupied territories of Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy, Latvia, Slovakia, Russia, Czecho-Slovakia, Lorraine, Belgium, Eupen-Malmedy, and for the period from 1939-1945 it has been testified:

"The SD did not have anything to do with the execution of the so-called Night-and Fog Decree (Nacht-und Nebel-Erlass). The decree was not known to the members of the SD".

24. Subject: Execution of "Summary Special Trials"

(St.o.E. VI H English Trialbrief Page 55)

In 209 declarations in lieu of an oath for the RSHA-Office III, as well as a large number of the administrative areas of the Reich territory, the occupied territories in Russia, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy, it has been testfied for the years 1939-1945:

"The SD participated in no way in summary special proceedings for the conviction and execution of nationals of occupied countries".

25.Point: Execution of collective responsibility measures (St.o.E. VI I engl.TrialBrief Seite 56)

The following is asserted in 210 affirmations in lieu of oath for the whole department of RSHA Office III, the occupied territories of Russia, Italy, the Czech Territories, Jugoslavia, Slovakia, Poland, and in detail for the bulk of the whole German territory, in the period 1939 - 1945:

> "The SD did not in any way participate in the application of what is termed "Sippenhaftung" (collective responsibility through arrest of relatives).

26.Point: Killing of prisoners prior to their liberation by allied troops. (St.o.E. VI J engl.Trial Brief Page 56)

The following is asserted in 189 affirmations in lieu of oath for the whole department of the RSHA Office III and in detail for the bulk of German territory and the occupied territories of Bialystok, Poland, the Czech Territories, as well as in a large collective statement, for the period from 1939 to 1945:

> "The SD neither received nor issued instructions for nor took part in the killing of prisoners in places of detention or other places in order to prevent them from being freed by Allied troops".

27.Point: Prisons, Prisoners and Arrests (St.o.E. VI J English Trial Brief Page 56 and VI A Page 40 (3012-PS)

The following is asserted in 32 affirmations in lieu of oath for the occupied territories of Russia, Eupen-Malmedy, Italy, Belgium, Latvia, as well as the whole department of the RSHA office III and in detail for the territories of Brunswick, South Hanover, Aachen, West Prussia, East Prussia, Bavaria, the Saar Territory, the Palatinate, the Rhine Province, Wuerttemberg, Vienna, the Upper Danube, Steirmark, Tyrol, the Sudeten Territory, for the years 1935 to 1945:

(Page 12 of original)

"The Security Service at no time and nowhere carried out arrests. There were no Security Service prisons nor Security Service prisoners."

Point 28: Confiscation and distribution of public and private property.
(St.o.E. VI K English Trial Letter, Page 57).

In 495 declaraitons in lieu of oath for the Security Service Main Office, the Reich Security Main Office, the later Office III, individually for the whole of the German territory and the occupied territories of Alsace, France, Russia, Eupen-Malmedy, Poland, Italy, Lorraine, Luxemburg and Czechoslovakia, it is certified for the years 1934 - 1945:

"The Security Service had no competence of execution whatever, neither for the confiscation or distribution of public and private property."

Point 29: Examinations and examinations of 3rd grade.
(Sto.o.E. VI L English Trial Letter, Page 37)

In 76 declarations in lieu of oath for the sphere of the Reich Security Main Office - Office III, as well as for each of the territories of Brunswick, Munich - Upper Bavaria, the Saar-District, the Palatinate, Dortmund, the Rhine Province, Wuerttemberg, East Prussia, the Upper Danube, Central Germany, Lower Bavaria-the Upper Palatinate, Berlin-Brandenburg, Thuringia, Leipzig, a number of single towns and official spheres of the Security Service (with the German Reich territory), as well as for the occupied territories of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Russia, it is certified for the years 1934 - 1945:

"The Security Service did not carry out any examinations, nor such of 3rd grade.

Point 30a: Persecution of Jews.
(St.o.E. VII A English Trial Letter)

In 259 declarations in lieu of oath for the whole of the sphere of the Security Service Main Office, as well as for that of the Office III -

afterwards, the Reich Security Main Office for each of the territories of Saxony, the Saar-District, the Palatinate, Munich-Upper Bavaria, Cologne, Vienna, Linz- the Upper Danube, Baden, Berlin, Styria, Sudeten Territory, Hamburg, Wuerttemberg, Upper Silesia, the Tyrol, Leipzig, Thuringia, Hesse-Nassau, Hannover, Silesia, Magdeburg-Anhalt, Swabia, Pomerania, West-Prussia, Schwerin, the Electorate of Hesse, the Bavarian Ostmark, the Rhine Province, the Lower Danube, East Prussia, a number of towns and official spheres of the Security Service (totalling the German Reich Territory) and the occupied territories of Eupen-Malmedy, Alsace, Poland, Italy, Nice-France, Tzechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, it is certified for the years 1933 - 1945:

"The SD (Office III RSHA) gave no information about Jews to the Gestapo and did not participate in the persecution of the Jews."

Point 30 b: Persecution of the Jews - Progrom of the Jews of Nov. 8 - 9, 1938. (St. o. E. VII A English Trialbrief Page 60)

In 107 declarations in lieu of oath for the SD Main Office, RSHA-Office III as well as individually for the territories of Central Francony, Saxony, Bavarian Ostmark, Rhine Province, East Prussia, Palatinate, Dessau, Thuringia Hesse, the whole of Bavaria, Berlin-Brandenburg, Vienna, Wiesbaden, Magdeburg-Anhalt, Suabia, Halle-Central Germany, Danzig, Schwerin, Pomerania, Hamburg, Wuerttemberg, Frankfurt/Main, a number of cities and former spheres of activity of the SD (with a few exceptions, the whole German Reich territory), it is certified:

"The SD did not take part in measures against Jews and Jewish property on November 8/9, 1938."

Point 31: Persecution of the churches. (St. o. E. VII B English Trialbrief Page 63)

In 259 declarations in lieu of oath for the RSHA-Office III, previously SD-Main Office, as well as individually the territories of Wuerttemberg, Berlin-Brandenburg, Lower Bavaria-Upper Palatinate, Saxony, Thuringia, Palatinate, Central German, Baden, Bavarian Ostmark, the whole of Bavaria, Carinthia, Sudeten-Territory, Hamburg, Upper Silesia, Tirol, Hesse, Rhine Province, Westphalia, Magdeburg-Anhalt, Silesia, Vienna, Danzig-West Prussia, Kiel, Schwerin, Dessau, Bremen, a further large number of declarations (altogether the German Reich territory) and the occupied territories of Alsace, Italy, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Slovakia, Poland, it is certified for the years 1933 - 1945:

"The SD was not concerned with church questions and therefore did not take part in a prosecution of churches."

I certify the exactitude of the excerpt copy.

Nuernberg, 14 August 1946

s/ signature (illegible)
Defense Counsel of the organization SD